

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

106th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 63

March 24, 1999, 9:05 p.m.  
Page S-3226 Temp. Record

## BUDGET RESOLUTION/Veterans Health Care Funding Increase

**SUBJECT:** Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 2000-2009 . . . S.Con. Res. 20. Johnson amendment No. 153.

### ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 99-0

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, S.Con. Res. 20, the Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 2000-2009: will cut the debt held by the public (money that the Federal Government owes to creditors other than itself) in half over 10 years; will fully fund Medicare (all of the President's proposed \$9 billion in Medicare cuts were rejected; as a result, this budget will allow \$20.4 billion more in Medicare spending over the next 10 years); will save the entire \$1.8 trillion in Social Security surpluses over the next 10 years for Social Security; will provide for \$778 billion in net tax relief over the next 10 years (in contrast, the President's budget would increase the tax burden by \$96 billion net over 10 years), and will adhere to the spending restraints (discretionary spending caps and pay-go provisions) of the bipartisan budget agreement as enacted in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and the Taxpayer Reform Act of 1997 (the President's proposed budget, in contrast, would dramatically increase spending in violation of that bipartisan agreement, and would result in \$2.2 trillion more in total Federal debt at the end of 10 years than proposed in this Senate budget).

**The Johnson amendment** would adjust the functional totals with the intention of increasing funding for veterans health care by \$2 billion in fiscal year (FY) 2000 and by paying for that increase by making an across-the-board cut in other discretionary programs. The amendment would also express the sense of the Senate that defense programs would be exempt from the across-the-board cut, and that if the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) were to determine that there was an on-budget surplus in FY 2000 then the \$2 billion in cuts would be restored.

**Those favoring** the amendment contended:

Veterans deserve and need more money for health care. The President's proposed budget for veterans' health care is woefully

(See other side)

YEAS (99)				NAYS (0)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republican (54 or 100%)		Democrats (45 or 100%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans (1)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Helms	Akaka	Kennedy			Lugar <sup>4</sup>	
Allard	Hutchinson	Baucus	Kerrey				
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Bayh	Kerry				
Bennett	Inhofe	Biden	Kohl				
Bond	Jeffords	Bingaman	Landrieu				
Brownback	Kyl	Boxer	Lautenberg				
Bunning	Lott	Breaux	Leahy				
Burns	Mack	Bryan	Levin				
Campbell	McCain	Byrd	Lieberman				
Chafee	McConnell	Cleland	Lincoln				
Cochran	Murkowski	Conrad	Mikulski				
Collins	Nickles	Daschle	Moynihan				
Coverdell	Roberts	Dodd	Murray				
Craig	Roth	Dorgan	Reed				
Crapo	Santorum	Durbin	Reid				
DeWine	Sessions	Edwards	Robb				
Domenici	Shelby	Feingold	Rockefeller				
Enzi	Smith, Bob	Feinstein	Sarbanes				
Fitzgerald	Smith, Gordon	Graham	Schumer				
Frist	Snowe	Harkin	Torricelli				
Gorton	Specter	Hollings	Wellstone				
Gramm	Stevens	Inouye	Wyden				
Grams	Thomas	Johnson					
Grassley	Thompson						
Gregg	Thurmond						
Hagel	Voinovich						
Hatch	Warner						

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

Compiled and written by the staff of the Republican Policy Committee—Larry E. Craig, Chairman

inadequate. This budget is better--it adds \$1 billion in funding. More money is still needed though. Many veterans groups have studied this issue and have found that a \$3 billion increase is needed this year rather than just a \$1 billion increase. We therefore have proposed this amendment to add the additional \$2 billion needed. As an offset, we have proposed an across-the-board cut in non-defense, non-veterans spending. For the last 3 years there has been no increase for veterans' health care. An increase is urgently needed now. We strongly urge our colleagues to adopt this amendment so that we may provide adequate funding to take care of the health care needs of those in whom we are indebted.

**While favoring** the amendment, some Senators expressed the following reservations:

This amendment would make us cut all other non-defense programs, including programs for education, health research, the environment, and housing. All day long we have been hearing complaints that not enough money has been provided for those programs. If our colleagues vote for this amendment, they must keep in mind that the price is that those programs are going to be cut even more. We favor increased veterans' health care funding, so we support this amendment, but we are not pleased with the offset.

**No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.**